R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 003 692 24

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION ON THE PROGRESS IN READING ACHIEVEMENT AND SELF-CONCEPT OF CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHILDREN.

BY- CARLTON, LESSIE MOORE, ROBERT H.
ILLINOIS STATE UNIV., NORMAL

REPORT NUMBER CRP-S-190 PUB DATE 65
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$3.32 83P.

DESCRIPTORS- *READING ACHIEVEMENT, *SELF CONCEPT, TEACHING TECHNIQUES, *DRAMATIC PLAY, *CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED, LOW INCOME GROUPS, *ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, READING INSTRUCTION, *SELF DIRECTED CLASSROOMS, BASAL READING, NORMAL, ILLINOIS

THE EFFECTS OF A TECHNIQUE ON THE READING ACHIEVEMENT AND SELF-CONCEPT OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN WERE STUDIED. THE POPULATION SAMPLED WAS DRAWN FROM TWO SCHOOLS IN A LOW SOCIOECONOMIC AREA. THE PUPILS SELECTED FROM GRADES 1 THROUGH 4 WERE EQUALLY ASSIGNED TO AN EXPERIMENTAL OR CONTROL GROUP. THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP RECEIVED INSTRUCTION BY SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION TECHNIQUES. THE CONTROL GROUP RECEIVED READING INSTRUCTION BY THE USE OF A BASAL READER. THE GAINS MADE ON ACHIEVEMENT WERE DETERMINED BY PRE- AND POST-TEST PROCEDURES. SELF-CONCEPT QUESTIONS WERE CHECKED BEFORE AND AFTER THE DRAMATIZATION PERIOD BY THE TEACHER AND OBSERVERS. THE MAJOR CONCLUSIONS INDICATED (1) SIGNIFICANT GAINS IN READING WERE ACHIEVED BY THE FOUR GRADE GROUPS USING THE SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION IN THE READING PROGRAM AND (2) THE SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION PERIODS PRODUCED FAVORABLE CHANGES IN SELF-CONCEPT OF THE CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN. (RS)

ED003692

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION ON THE PROGRESS IN READING ACHIEVEMENT AND SELF-CONCEPT OF CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHILDREN

Lessie Carlton and Robert H. Moore
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois
September 1, 1964-August 31, 1965

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Cooperative Research Project S-190

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
	Purpose of the Study	1
	Definition of Terms Used in the Study	2
	Sources of Data	4
	Procedures Employed in the Study	6
	Distinguishing Feature of the Study	7
	Summary	8
	Organization of the Remainder of the Report	9
II.	RELATED LITERATURE	10
	Self-Concept	10
	Self-Directive Dramatization	10
III.	READING ACHIEVEMENT	15
	Self-Directive Dramatization	15
	Tests Administered	17
	Matched Experimental and Control Groups	18
	Presentation of the Findings	25
	Summary and Discussion of Reading Achievement	47
IV.	SELF-CONCEPT	54
	Self-Concept as Used in the Study	54
	Self-Concept Questions	55
	Checking the Self-Concept Questions	57
	Changes in Self-Concept	58

CHAPTER PAGE

Correlation between Gains in Reading and Changes in Self-Concept..... 66

Summary and Discussion of Self-Concept Changes and Progress in Reading..... 67

V. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS..... 71

Conclusions..... 72

Implications..... 73

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Matched Experimental and Control Groups Grade One	19
II.	Matched Experimental and Control Groups Grade Two	21
III.	Matched Experimental and Control Groups Grade Three	22
IV.	Matched Experimental and Control Groups Grade Four	24
V.	Reading Grade Scores of Experimental Group Grade One Before and After the Self-Directive Dramatization Period	26
VI.	Reading Grade Scores of Experimental Group Grade Two Before and After the Self-Directive Dramatization Period	27
VII.	Reading Grade Scores of Experimental Group Grade Three Before and After the Self-Directive Dramatization Period	29
VIII.	Reading Grade Scores of Experimental Group Grade Four Before and After the Self-Directive Dramatization Period	31
IX.	Gains Made in Reading by Experimental and Control Groups Grade Two during First S lf-Directive Dramatization Period	32
X.	Gains Made in Reading by Experimental and Control Groups Grade Three during First Self-Directive Dramatization Period	34
XI.	Gains Made in Reading by Experimental and Control Groups Grade Four during First Self-Directive Dramatization Period	36
XII.	Gains Made in Reading by Experimental and Control Groups Grade One during Second Self-Directive Dramatization Period	37
XIII.	Gains Made in Reading by Experimental and Control Groups Grade Two during Second Self-Directive Dramatization Period	39

TABLE PAGE

XIV. Gains Made in Reading by Experimental and Control Groups Grade Three during Second Self-Directive Dramatization Period..... 40

XV. Gains Made in Reading by Experimental and Control Groups Grade Four during Second Self-Directive Dramatization Period..... 41

XVI. Gains Made in Reading by Experimental and Control Groups Grade Two during First and Second Self-Directive Dramatization Periods..... 43

XVII. Gains Made in Reading by Experimental and Control Groups Grade Three during First and Second Self-Directive Dramatization Periods..... 45

XVIII. Gains Made in Reading by Experimental and Control Groups Grade Four during First and Second Self-Directive Dramatization Periods..... 46

XIX. Number of Self-Concept Checks Grade One Before and After the Self-Directive Dramatization Period..... 59

XX. Number of Self-Concept Checks Grade Two Before and After the Self-Directive Dramatization Periods..... 61

XXI. Number of Self-Concept Checks Grade Three Before and After the Self-Directive Dramatization Periods..... 62

XXII. Number of Self-Concept Checks Grade Four Before and After the Self-Directive Dramatization Periods..... 64

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

In this chapter information is presented concerning the following phases of the study:

1. Purposes of the study
2. Definitions of terms used in the study
3. Sources of data used in the study
4. Procedures employed in the study
5. Distinguishing features of the study
6. Organization of the remainder of the report
7. Summary

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study was conducted to discover answers to the following questions:

1. Can significant gains in reading be achieved with groups of culturally disadvantaged elementary school children through the use of self-directive dramatization in the reading program in a regular classroom?
2. Can significantly greater gains be achieved with groups of culturally disadvantaged elementary school children through the use of self-directive dramatization than through the use of methods involving

primarily the reading of one or two basic readers in small groups or in the whole class in a regular classroom?

3. Can favorable changes in the self-concept of culturally disadvantaged elementary school children be brought about through the use of self-directive dramatization in the reading program in a regular classroom?
4. Will there be a correlation between gains in reading achievement and changes in self-concept on the part of groups of culturally disadvantaged elementary school children with whom self-directive dramatization in reading is used in a regular classroom?

The basic terms and definitions of each used throughout this study are:

1. Self-directive dramatization. Self-directive dramatization of stories is not the same as creative dramatics. It is the pupil's own original, imaginative, spontaneous interpretation of a character of his own choosing in a story which he has selected and read cooperatively with other pupils in his group which was formed for the time being and for a particular story only. There is no teacher dominated discussion of the stories, no teacher assigned parts to dramatize, nor any rehearsal of the stories before they are dramatized.
2. Self-directive. Because the emphasis in self-directive dramatization is placed upon what the pupil does instead

of upon what the teacher does not do, the term self-directive is used instead of non-directive.

3. Self-concept. In the use of the term self-concept, the assumption has been made that a pupil's behavior reflects what he thinks about himself and how he feels about himself. It is also assumed that self-concept may be desirable or undesirable; thus the terms positive and negative self-concepts have come to be used. Involved in self-concept is what an individual thinks he is, what he thinks he can do, and what he thinks he cannot do.

4. Change in self-concept. A change in the self-concept of a pupil is said to have occurred if he did not have the same number of checks on the self-concept questions (Chap. IV) after a dramatization period that he had preceding a dramatization period.

5. Dramatization period. A dramatization period may be any given length of time during which there is a concentration on the dramatization of stories. In this study, it consisted of approximately three and one-half months.

6. Observers. Persons referred to as observers are those school adults who assisted in checking the self-concept questions or helped obtain photographic, taped, or written records of what was said or done in order to get needed records completed.

7. Regular Classroom. Regular classroom denotes a classroom which contains pupils who have not been placed

there because of any particular ability, nor because of the lack of any ability. They are there because they are at a particular grade level.

SOURCES OF DATA USED IN THE STUDY

The experimental group. The experimental groups in the study were made up of one first, one second, one third, and one fourth grade class in a public elementary school in Joliet, Illinois. The average number of pupils in each class at the beginning of the year was 30.

The teachers of the four grades consisted of three women and one man, all of whom had been taught the techniques of using self-directive dramatization with all the children in a regular classroom. Two of the teachers had taken part in a previous study of the same nature, but with mostly middle class white children. One teacher had taught two years in a school where the use of basal reading books and three reading groups was the common practice. One teacher had not had any experience in teaching, except the nine weeks of student teaching required for graduation.

The pupils came from a low socio-economic area and were considered culturally disadvantaged children. The school population was composed of 85 percent Negro children, 10 percent white children, and 5 percent Mexican and Puerto Rican children. Families were large and many children came from broken homes. A great many of the children were inadequately clothed and poorly nourished. Almost all the pupils went home at noon both because the school was near their homes and because there was no school lunch program. Children frequently came to school crying because of hunger, and, in the winter, because of cold.

Since classes in the school were not grouped according to ability or other criteria, except for the fact that they were in a specific grade, the experimental classes represented a cross-section of the total school population. A large percentage of the children were below the level of the grade in which they were found.

The history of the school was one of frequent turnover of classroom teachers. Principals also stayed at the school for a very short period of time. There was a lack of community spirit in relation to school. Children moved in and out of the community often. Very few school records of the children were available.

The control group. Matches for each pupil were selected from other classes in the same school and from classes in another elementary school in the same school system. They received reading instruction chiefly through the use of a basal reader, and mainly in formal whole-class or small group sessions.

The second school, from which many of the pupils in the control groups were drawn, was similar in racial make-up and socio-economic level to the school in which the experiment was conducted. However, the children in this school seemed to be more stable emotionally than those in the school containing the experimental groups.

The teachers of the rooms from which the control pupils were selected were, in general, similar in training to the teachers of the experimental classes. However, most of them had more total experience in teaching, more experience in teaching the culturally disadvantaged, and had been in their present positions longer than had the teachers of the experimental classes.

PROCEDURES EMPLOYED IN THE STUDY

Procedures preceding and after the self-directive dramatization period.

1. A group intelligence test and a reading achievement test were administered before the self-directive dramatization period was begun. A comparable form of the achievement test was administered at the end of the dramatization period to determine the gain made by each pupil in reading.
2. The self-concept questions, which identified negative behaviors of the children, were checked by the teacher of each grade and other observers for each pupil in the experimental group preceding the dramatization period. At the end of the dramatization period, the questions were checked again. Since the questions were stated negatively, a decrease in the number of questions checked meant a gain for the pupil.

Presentation of the findings. The data have been reported through:

A. The use of tables to show
   1. Matched experimental and control groups in the four grades.
   2. The reading grade scores of experimental groups before and after the two self-directive dramatization periods.
   3. Gains made in reading by experimental and control groups during the first self-directive dramatization period.

4. Gains made in reading by experimental and control groups during the second self-directive dramatization period.
5. Gains made in reading by experimental and control groups during the first and second dramatization periods.
6. The number of self-concept checks for each grade of the experimental group before and after the self-directive dramatization periods.

B. The use of statistics to report
1. If the experimental groups made significant gains in reading, using t for matched pairs.(Chapter III)
2. If there was a correlation between gains made in reading achievement and changes in self-concept, using Pearson's Product Moment Correlation. (Chapter IV)

DISTINGUISHING FEATURE OF THE STUDY

Although a study using self-directive dramatization as a part of the reading program as a means of bringing about gains in reading achievement and altering the self-concepts of children in a regular classroom had been conducted with middle class white children, no experiment has been found showing that self-directive dramatization has been used in a regular classroom as a part of the reading program with culturally disadvantaged children for the purpose of achieving gains in reading and changing the self-concepts of the children from a negative to a more positive one. Therefore, the distinguishing feature of this study is the fact that those children included in the study were culturally disadvantaged children.

ORGANIZATION OF REMAINDER OF THE REPORT

A review of literature that is related to this study is presented in Chapter II. Reading achievement has been discussed in Chapter III, and findings on self-concept are shown in Chapter IV. Conclusions and implications are given in Chapter V, the final chapter.

SUMMARY

In Chapter I, this report has been concerned with the purposes of the study, definitions of terms used in the study, sources of data, procedures employed in the study, and the organization of the remainder of the report.

The purposes of the study were to discover the effects of self-directive dramatization on the reading achievement and self-concept of culturally disadvantaged children, and to see if significantly greater gains in reading could be achieved with the culturally disadvantaged children.

The following terms which are used in the study have been defined: self-directive dramatization, self-directive, self-concept, dramatization period, observers, and regular classroom.

The data in this study were collected from two culturally disadvantaged schools. Four teachers were involved in the study. The pupils were from a low socio-economic area.

Tests were administered to the children at named periods throughout the year and self-concept questions were checked at such times. The data have been reported through tables and statistics.

No report of studies of the use of self-directive dramatization with culturally disadvantaged children on the improvement of self-

concept and reading achievement were found.

The remainder of the report is organized as follows:

Chapter II. Related Literature

Chapter III. Reading Achievement

Chapter IV. Self-Concept

Chapter V. Conclusions and Implications

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to give a brief summary of the literature that is related to:

I. Self-concept

II. Self-directive dramatization

Wylie has given meaning to the term "self-concept" in the following quotation:

> In psychological discussions the word "self" has been used in many different ways. Two chief meanings emerge, however: the self as subject or agent, and the self as the individual who is known to himself.... The words 'self-concept' have come into common use to refer to the second meaning...(12, p. vii).

Carlton has said that self-concept refers to ways in which the individual sees himself, and it involves what the individual thinks he is, what he thinks he can do, and what he thinks he cannot do. In addition, the assumption was made that a person's behavior reflects what he thinks about himself and how he feels about himself (4, pp. 4,5).

Symonds has advanced the theory that the goals selected by a person are related to the concept he has of himself. He said that "he who values himself highly will strive for high goals while he who has a low opinion of himself will be content with mediocre attainment. (10, p. 97).

Coleman said that one's success in learning depends upon what he thinks he can do, and in order for a person to be fully functioning, he must see a self that he thinks can perform the task at hand (7, p. 34).

Kelley expressed much the same idea when he said that in order for a person to be fully functioning, he must see a self that he thinks can perform the task at hand (9, p. 34).

In discussing the behavior of children, Snygg and Combs said:

> What a person does and how he behaves are determined by the concept he has of himself and his abilities.... What a child thinks about himself may be seen in his continuous talking, beating up the younger children, buying off the older ones with lollipops, and always trying to be the center of attention (11, p. 35).

Bledsoe said that an individual's perception of himself is one of the most important elements of his total behavior. In a recent study, he made the assumption that education can facilitate human development by providing an educational program which will enable people to develop self-concepts useful for effective living (5).

Baller and Charles have dealt with the enactment by the individaul of different roles as a way of developing and understanding of the ways in which a person sees himself. They state that the child may work out answers to some of his problems as he engages in role behaviors with others (4, p. 381).

One of the aims in the use of self-directive dramatization in the reading program is to change the pupil's self-concept from a negative to a more positive one. Snygg and Combs said that Raimy clearly demonstrated in his writings in 1943 that changes in self-concept do occur through non-directive therapy (11, p. 29). They express the belief that changes in self-concept occur through non-directive therapy and that these changes are the most striking aspect of the therapy(11, p. 28).

The generally favorable effects of non-directive (or self-directive) therapy and non-directive play therapy on self-concept development and/or reading have been discussed by Axline (1,2) Fisher (8) Bills (3) and others. However, in none of these experiments described by these

authors was the work carried on by a classroom teacher with all the children in a regular classroom as a part of the reading program. Bills concluded the report of his study with the statement that "if personal changes do result from non-directive therapy and if these techniques are adaptable to the classroom, then an approach to teaching is indicated which would include a corrective mental hygiene aspect (3, p. 148)."

Carlton (6) created and employed self-directive dramatization of stories with all the children in the teaching of reading within the frame of reference of the regular classroom as a medium for non-directive therapy and for the purpose of achieving gains in reading. Self-concept questions were formulated and used as a checklist in observing changes in self-concept. She secured the cooperation of three other teachers in conducting similar experiments in as many additional classrooms. In three cases, the classes were in university laboratory schools, in two cases, in schools in large public school systems, and in one case, in a small rural elementary school. In all cases, the classes could be called "average" classes, in that they were heterogeneous in mental ability and reading level and made up largely of white children of middle class socio-economic standing.

In all cases, significant gains in reading were made. The average gains in reading in the six classes during the three and one-half months experimental periods ranged from 0.75 to 1.36. Favorable changes in self-concept occurred in all classes, judging from changes in behavior which were considered to be indicative of self-concept changes. In all classes but one, a positive correlation between self-concept changes and gains in reading achievement was found.

From a study of the literature, no situation has been discovered in which self-directive dramatization in reading has been employed as

a basic reading instruction technique and for the purpose of improving the self-concept with classes made up wholly or in large part of culturally disadvantaged children.

REFERENCES

1. Axline, Virginia. Play Therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1947.

2. Axline, Virginia. Dibs. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963.

3. Bills, R. E. "Nondirective Play Therapy with Retarded Readers," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 14: 140-149, April, 1949.

4. Baller, Warren R. and Don C. Charles. The Psychology of Human Growth and Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961.

5. Bledsoe, Joseph C. "The Self Concepts of Elementary School Children in Relation to their Academic Achievement, Intelligence, Interest, and Manifest Anxiety." Cooperative Research Project Number 1008, Washington, D. C., 1963.

6. Carlton, Lessie. A Report on Self-Directive Dramatization in the Regular Elementary School Classroom and Relationships Discovered with Progress in Reading Achievement and Self-Concept Changes. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Houston, Houston, Texas, 1963.

7. Coleman, James C. Personality Dynamics and Effective Behavior. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1960.

8. Fisher, Bernard. "Group Therapy with Retarded Readers," Journal of Educational Psychology, 44: 354-360, October, 1943.

9. Kelley, Earl C. "The Fully Functioning Self," Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming. (Washington, D. C., Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development), 1962.

10. Symonds, Percieval M. The Ego and The Self. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1951.

11. Snygg, Donald and Arthur W. Combs. Individual Behavior. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.

12. Wylie, Ruth C. The Self-Concept. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

CHAPTER III

READING ACHIEVEMENT

Data related to procedures and progress in reading made by the experimental and control groups are presented in this chapter. Attention has been directed to the following questions:

1. Can significant gains in reading be achieved with groups of culturally disadvantaged elementary school children through the use of self-directive dramatization in the reading program in a regular classroom?
2. Can significantly greater gains be achieved with groups of culturally disadvantaged elementary school children through the use of self-directive dramatization than through the use of methods involving primarily the reading of one or two basic readers in small groups or in the whole class in a regular classroom?

SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION

The method of beginning the self-directive dramatization of stories varied according to the grade and the teacher. However, the way it was done in one classroom serves as an example for the beginning in another classroom. The teacher brought many reading books of different kinds and reading levels into the classroom. For several days preceding the beginning of the self-directive dramatization of stories, the teacher talked about selecting, reading, and dramatizing stories. The children looked at books and found stories they thought they would like to read

or hear read. They learned what was meant by a character in a story, and how to skim through a story quickly, noting the number and names of characters in a story. The pupils voluntarily "acted out" different parts in stories that the teacher had read to them, or that they had read. The teacher wrote "Who Am I?" on the chalkboard and the pupils "acted out" the part of some character of their own choosing for the other pupils to guess the character.

The first time stories were dramatized cooperatively by the pupils, the teacher selected five stories of different reading levels and wrote the names of the stories and the characters in each story on the chalkboard. (This was not entirely self-directive but it was a way for the pupils to learn what to do.) Each pupil then selected the story he wished to read with others in a group. The number of characters deteremined the number of pupils who formed a group. Each group sat in a differenct part of the room, and the pupils in each group took turns reading parts of the story aloud to those in their group until all of the story had been read. After a story was read, each pupil in a group decided which character he wished to portray when the story was dramatized. When two children in a group chose the same character, they were asked to make their own decision as to which person would choose another character. After the characters were selected, each group took turns dramatizing the selected story. Pupils in the groups not dramatizing stories for the time being made up the audience for the group doing the dramaization.

There was no rehearsal of a story and no costumes and props were used. The pupils in each group chose a leader for the group for the particular time only. It was the job of the leader to tell each pupil

when to read, when the characters should be chosen, and to ask the teacher to help with the pronunciation of words or with any other problems which they could not solve for themselves.

After the stories were read and dramatized, the teacher suggested that they talk about the dramatization of stories for the next day. The help of the teacher was needed for them to get a better understanding of how to select their stories. The leader of each group put the books used by his group back on the tables from which they had been taken.

TESTS ADMINISTERED

In order to determine if pupils taught by mean of self-directive dramatization would make greater gains in reading achievement than pupils taught mainly by means of a basal reading text and small group instruction, pupils in experimental classes were matched with pupils from control groups on the basis of sex, intelligence quotient scores, and reading grade scores. (See Chapter IV for Self-Concept.)

Preceding the first dramatization period, the intelligence quotient score was determined by administering the California Short Form Test of Mental Maturity, S-Form (1957), Pre-Primary Grades in grade one, the California Short Form Test of Mental Maturity, S-Form (1957), Primary Grades in grades two and three, and the California Short Form Test of Mental Maturity, S-Form (1957), Intermediate Grades in grade four.

In order to obtain some measure of progress in reading, the reading section of the Gray-Votaw-Rogers Achievement Test on vocabulary and paragraph meaning, Primary Grades, Form B, was administered as a pre-test preceding the first dramatization period in grades two and three (Grade one was not tested until the second dramatization period), and the

reading section of the Gray-Votaw-Rogers Achievement Test on vocabulary and paragraph meaning, Intermediate Grades, Form B, was administered as a pre-test preceding the first dramatization period in grade four.

Following the first dramatization period (approximately three and one-half months), the reading section of the Gray-Votaw-Rogers Achievement Test on vocabulary and paragraph meaning, Primary Grades, Form C, was adminstered as a post-test in grades two and three, and the reading section of the Gray-Votaw-Rogers Achievement Test on vocabulary and paragraph meaning, Intermediate Grades, Form C, was administered as a post-test in grade four.

The first post-test reading grades scores in grades two, three, and four were used as the pre-test scores at the beginning of the second dramatization period. In order to obtain some measure of progress in the first grade, the reading section of the Gray-Votaw-Rogers Achievement Test on vocabulary and paragraph meaning, Primary Grades, Form C, was administered as a pre-test preceding the second dramatization period.

Following the second dramatization period, the reading section of the Gray-Votaw-Rogers Acheivement Test on vocabulary and paragraph meaning, Primary Grades, Form D, was administered as a post-test in grades one, two, and three, and the reading section of the Gray-Votaw-Rogers Achievement Test on vocabulary and paragraph meaning, Intermediate Grades, Form D, was administered as a post-test in grade four.

MATCHED EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

In the first four columns of Table I, the number, sex, intelligence quotient score, and the first reading grade score of the 26 children in the first grade experimental group are given. In the next four columns of Table I,

TABLE I

MATCHED EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS GRADE ONE

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP				CONTROL GROUP			
PUPIL NUMBER	SEX	I.Q.*	FRGS*	PUPIL NUMBER	SEX	I.Q.*	FRGS*
1.	F	116	1.9	1.	F	105	1.9
2.	M	77	1.7	2.	M	79	1.6
3.	M	83	1.3	3.	M	82	1.2
4.	M	99	1.3	4.	M	104	1.1
5.	F	85	1.2	5.	F	81	1.3
6.	M	96	1.2	6.	M	104	1.1
7.	F	80	1.1	7.	F	79	1.4
8.	F	74	1.1	8.	F	77	1.3
9.	M	95	1.1	9.	M	88	1.2
10.	F	86	1.1	10.	F	80	1.4
11.	M	82	1.0	11.	M	89	1.2
12.	M	89	1.0	12.	M	88	1.0
13.	M	84	0.0	13.	M	76	0.0
14.	F	82	0.0	14.	F	84	1.2
15.	M	69	0.0	15.	M	71	0.0
16.	F	94	0.0	16.	F	94	0.0
17.	M	84	0.0	17.	M	82	0.0
18.	F	78	0.0	18.	F	78	1.1
19.	F	80	0.0	19.	F	81	1.1
20.	F	75	0.0	20.	F	67	0.0
21.	F	98	0.0	21.	F	92	1.0
22.	M	95	0.0	22.	M	95	1.0
23.	M	85	0.0	23.	M	84	0.0
24.	F	78	0.0	24.	F	78	0.0
25.	F	85	0.0	25.	F	87	1.1
26.	M	67	0.0	26.	M	73	0.0

* I.Q., Intelligence Quotient; FRGS, First Reading Grade Score.

the number, sex, intelligence quotient score, and the first reading grade score of the children selected as matches for the children in the experimental group are given.

In this grade, there were 13 boys and 13 girls. The mean intelligence quotient score for the experimental group was 85.23 and, for the control group, 84.54. The range was 67 to 116 for the experimental group and 67 to 105 for the control group. The mean reading grade scores for the experimental and control groups were 0.58 and 0.85, respectively. The range was 0.0 to 1.9 for both groups.

Fourteen of the 26 children in the experimental group were not able to score on the reading test. Only nine of the 14 could be matched with children who also did not score.

Data concerning the children in the second grade experimental class and their matches are given in Table II. Seventeen of the 27 children in this grade were girls. The mean intelligence quotient score for the experimental group was 91.81; for matches it was 91.34. The range was 67 to 111 for the experimental group and 64 to 112 for the control group. The mean reading grade score was 1.26 for the experimental group and 1.34 for the control group. The reading grade scores ranged from 0.0 to 1.9 for both groups. Two pupils did not score on this reading test; it was possible to match them with other pupils who also were unable to score.

Only five of the 27 pupils in the experimental group had an intelligence quotient score of 100 or over; seven of the children in the control group had intelligence quotient scores exceeding 100. Although the reading grade test was given at the end of the first month of the second grade, no child in either group had a reading grade score of 2.0 or greater.

In Table III data regarding experimental and control groups in the

TABLE II

MATCHED EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS GRADE TWO

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP				CONTROL GROUP			
PUPIL NUMBER	SEX	I.Q.*	FRGS*	PUPIL NUMBER	SEX	I.Q.*	FRGS*
1.	F	82	1.9	1.	F	81	1.9
2.	F	99	1.7	2.	F	104	1.9
3.	F	91	1.6	3.	F	90	1.6
4.	F	104	1.6	4.	F	105	1.6
5.	F	96	1.5	5.	F	98	1.6
6.	F	95	1.5	6.	F	88	1.1
7.	M	111	1.5	7.	M	112	1.7
8.	M	109	1.5	8.	M	107	1.4
9.	F	97	1.4	9.	F	92	1.5
10.	M	87	1.4	10.	M	86	1.5
11.	M	90	1.4	11.	M	91	1.5
12.	F	80	1.3	12.	F	83	1.2
13.	F	100	1.3	13.	F	104	1.2
14.	F	95	1.3	14.	F	89	1.7
15.	F	90	1.3	15.	F	91	1.3
16.	F	89	1.3	16.	F	96	1.3
17.	M	88	1.3	17.	M	87	1.2
18.	M	91	1.3	18.	M	90	1.3
19.	M	99	1.2	19.	M	103	1.7
20.	F	99	1.2	20.	F	88	1.3
21.	M	100	1.2	21.	M	100	1.1
22.	F	81	1.2	22.	F	82	1.3
23.	F	85	1.1	23.	F	86	1.5
24.	M	67	1.0	24.	M	64	1.4
25.	M	97	1.0	25.	M	93	1.4
26.	F	73	0.0	26.	F	75	0.0
27.	F	84	0.0	27.	F	81	0.0

* I.Q., Intelligence Quotient; FRGS, First Reading Grade Score.

TABLE III

MATCHED EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS GRADE THREE

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP				CONTROL GROUP			
PUPIL NUMBER	SEX	I.Q.*	FRGS*	PUPIL NUMBER	SEX	I.Q.*	FRGS*
1.	F	82	3.6	1.	F	86	3.7
2.	F	92	2.8	2.	F	91	2.7
3.	M	105	2.6	3.	M	104	2.3
4.	F	111	2.5	4.	F	103	3.0
5.	M	74	2.5	5.	M	73	2.5
6.	F	86	2.5	6.	F	87	2.5
7.	M	83	2.5	7.	M	81	2.5
8.	M	108	2.4	8.	M	113	2.8
9.	F	96	2.3	9.	F	90	2.3
10.	F	80	2.3	10.	F	86	2.2
11.	F	101	2.3	11.	F	103	2.9
12.	F	82	2.3	12.	F	81	2.2
13.	M	91	2.3	13.	M	93	2.3
14.	M	99	2.2	14,	M	96	2.1
15.	F	90	2.0	15.	F	92	2.0
16.	M	94	2.0	16.	M	94	2.1
17.	F	88	2.0	17.	F	89	1.9
18.	F	76	1.8	18.	F	86	2.3
19.	M	77	1.7	19.	M	79	1.8
20.	F	109	1.7	20.	F	94	2.3
21.	M	74	1.7	21.	M	76	1.6
22.	F	74	1.7	22.	F	73	2.3
23.	M	87	1.6	23.	M	88	1.7
24.	F	80	1.5	24.	F	90	1.7
25.	M	64	1.5	25.	M	70	1.7

* I.Q., Intelligence Quotient; FRGS, First Reading Grade Score.

third grade are given. There were 14 girls and 11 boys in this group. The mean intelligence quotient score was 88.12 for the experimental group and 88.72 for the control group. The range of intelligence quotient scores was 64 to 111 for the experimental group and 70 to 113 for the control group. The mean reading grade for the experimental group was 2.17; for the control group it was 2.05. Reading grade scores ranged from 1.5 to 3.6 for the experimental group and from 1.7 to 3.7 for the control group.

Twenty of the 25 pupils in the experimental group had intelligence quotient scores which fell below 100. For the control group, 21 of the 25 intelligence quotient scores were below 100. Only one child in the experimental and two in the control group had a reading grade score of 3.0 or higher, even though the test was administered at the end of the first month of the third grade. Eight experimental and six control group pupils had reading grade scores of below 2.0.

Data for the pupils in experimental group grade four and their matches are given in Table IV. Seventeen boys and 12 girls composed each of these groups. The mean intelligence quotient scores for the experimental and control groups were 99.31 and 99.07, respectively. The range was 71 to 135 for the experimental group and 76 to 131 for the control group. The reading grade score mean was 3.39 for the experimental group and 3.47 for the control group. For the experimental group the range in reading grade scores was 2.8 to 5.6; for the control group it was 2.8 to 6.0.

Twelve children in each group had intelligence quotient scores of 100 or higher, with one in each being above 130. Only seven children from the experimental group and six from the control group had intelligence quotient scores below 90. Seven of the experimental group children and

TABLE IV

MATCHED EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS GRADE FOUR

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP				CONTROL GROUP			
PUPIL NUMBER	SEX	I.Q.*	FRGS*	PUPIL NUMBER	SEX	I.Q.*	FRGS*
1.	F	124	5.6	1.	F	131	6.0
2.	M	106	4.7	2.	M	108	3.8
3.	M	115	4.6	3.	M	115	4.6
4.	M	135	4.4	4.	M	120	4.7
5.	F	101	4.1	5.	F	101	4.0
6.	F	97	4.0	6.	F	96	4.0
7.	F	114	4.0	7.	F	115	4.1
8.	M	105	3.8	8.	M	107	3.9
9.	F	90	3.6	9.	F	92	3.4
10.	F	110	3.5	10.	F	113	3.8
11.	M	88	3.3	11.	M	92	3.3
12.	M	102	3.3	12.	M	98	3.4
13.	M	84	3.3	13.	M	85	3.5
14.	M	109	3.2	14.	M	110	3.3
15.	M	71	3.1	15.	M	76	3.0
16.	F	96	3.1	16.	F	92	2.9
17.	M	103	3.0	17.	M	104	3.5
18.	F	97	2.9	18.	F	99	3.0
19.	F	88	2.9	19.	F	89	3.0
20.	M	91	2.8	20.	M	95	3.0
21.	F	91	2.8	21.	F	81	2.9
22.	M	106	2.8	22.	M	103	2.8
23.	M	96	2.8	23.	M	96	2.8
24.	F	83	2.8	24.	F	87	2.8
25.	M	97	2.8	25.	M	97	2.8
26.	M	93	2.8	26.	M	99	3.4
27.	M	75	2.8	27.	M	80	2.8
28.	F	96	2.8	28.	F	101	2.9
29.	M	88	2.8	29.	M	91	3.2

* I.Q., Intelligence Quotient; FRGS, First Reading Grade Score.

six of the control group had reading grade scores of 4.0 or better. This test was administered to the pupils in the fourth grade at the end of the first month of school. Twelve of the pupils from the experimental group had reading grade scores below the third grade level. Eight of the control group pupils had scores below the third grade level.

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

Reading grade scores of experimental groups before and after the two self-directive dramatization periods. In Table V the following data are given for each pupil in the experimental group grade one: The pupil number, the chronological age, the mental age, the intelligence quotient, the first reading grade score, the second reading grade score, and the gain made during the period between the two tests.

These pupils had a mean chronological age of 6 years and 7 months and a mean mental age of 5 years and 4 months. The mean intelligence quotient score was 85. The mean of the first reading grade scores was 0.58. Fourteen pupils did not score on the test.

The mean of the second reading grade scores was 1.71. All children except two had a reading grade score of 1.0 or higher and five children had a score of 2.0 or higher. The mean gain was 1.13. Of the 26 children, 24 made gains during the period, while two children who had reading scores of 0.0 at the beginning of the period had made no gain. The range in gains was 0.4 to 2.3. The difference between the means of the first and second reading grade scores was significant at the .01 level of confidence ($t=8.69$).

Table VI presents data on each of the two dramatization periods for the experimental group second grade. The mean chronological age of these

TABLE V

READING GRADE SCORES OF EXPERIMENTAL GROUP
GRADE ONE BEFORE AND AFTER THE
SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION PERIOD **

PUPIL NUMBER	CA*	MA*	I.Q.*	FRGS*	SRGS*	G*
1.	6-8	7-3	116	1.9	2.6	0.7
2.	6-4	4-11	77	1.7	2.4	0.7
3.	6-10	5-8	83	1.3	2.4	1.1
4.	6-0	6-0	99	1.3	2.1	0.8
5.	6-5	5-6	85	1.2	1.6	0.4
6.	6-4	6-1	96	1.2	2.0	0.8
7.	6-5	5-1	80	1.1	1.9	0.8
8.	6-9	5-0	74	1.1	2.3	1.2
9.	5-11	5-11	95	1.1	1.9	0.8
10.	5-11	5-1	86	1.1	1.5	0.4
11.	6-8	5-6	82	1.0	1.8	0.8
12.	6-10	6-1	89	1.0	1.4	0.4
13.	6-2	4-10	84	0.0	1.3	1.3
14.	6-1	5-0	82	0.0	1.9	1.9
15.	6-8	4-7	69	0.0	1.4	1.4
16.	5-11	5-7	94	0.0	1.7	1.7
17.	6-0	5-1	84	0.0	1.7	1.7
18.	5-11	4-7	78	0.0	0.0	0.0
19.	6-3	5-0	80	0.0	1.5	1.5
20.	6-6	4-11	75	0.0	1.8	1.8
21.	6-4	6-2	98	0.0	2.1	2.1
22.	6-7	6-3	95	0.0	1.3	1.3
23.	6-2	5-2	85	0.0	2.3	2.3
24.	6-6	5-1	78	0.0	2.1	2.1
25.	6-6	5-7	85	0.0	1.5	1.5
26.	6-7	4-0	67	0.0	0.0	0.0

* CA, Chronological Age; MA, Mental Age; I.Q., Intelligence Quotient; FRGS, First Reading Grade Score; SRGS, Second Reading Grade Score; G, Gain.

** Data not secured for Grade One during First Self-Directive Dramatization Period.

TABLE VI

READING GRADE SCORES OF EXPERIMENTAL GROUP
GRADE TWO BEFORE AND AFTER THE TWO
SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION PERIODS

	FIRST DRAMATIZATION PERIOD						SECOND DRAMATIZATION PERIOD		
PUPIL NUMBER	CA*	MA*	I.Q.*	FRGS*	SRGS*	G*	SRGS*	TRGS*	G*
1.	7-10	6-5	82	1.9	2.3	0.4	2.3	5.3	3.0
2.	7-8	7-7	99	1.7	2.3	0.6	2.3	4.1	1.8
3.	7-4	6-8	91	1.6	2.6	1.0	2.6	3.8	1.2
4.	7-0	7-4	104	1.6	2.7	1.1	2.7	2.8	0.1
5.	7-4	7-0	96	1.5	2.3	0.8	2.3	3.7	1.4
6.	7-0	6-8	95	1.5	2.1	0.6	2.1	3.6	1.5
7.	7-10	8-8	111	1.5	1.6	0.1	1.6	2.0	0.4
8.	7-8	8-4	109	1.5	2.0	0.5	2.0	3.0	1.0
9.	7-1	6-11	97	1.4	1.9	0.5	1.9	3.1	1.2
10.	7-8	6-8	87	1.4	1.7	0.3	1.7	3.7	2.0
11.	7-8	6-1	90	1.4	2.1	0.7	2.1	3.6	1.5
12.	7-4	5-11	80	1.3	2.3	1.0	2.3	3.0	0.7
13.	7-7	7-7	100	1.3	2.2	0.9	2.2	2.8	0.6
14.	6-11	6-7	95	1.3	2.0	0.7	2.0	2.8	0.8
15.	7-10	7-1	90	1.3	1.8	0.5	1.8	2.9	1.1
16.	7-4	6-6	89	1.3	2.1	0.8	2.1	3.5	1.4
17.	7-10	6-11	88	1.3	1.9	0.6	1.9	3.2	1.3
18.	7-1	6-5	91	1.3	1.7	0.4	1.7	2.7	1.0
19.	6-11	6-10	99	1.2	1.9	0.7	1.9	3.1	1.2
20.	7-1	7-0	99	1.2	1.7	0.5	1.7	2.7	1.0
21.	7-5	7-5	100	1.2	2.3	1.1	2.3	3.1	0.8
22.	7-5	6-0	81	1.2	1.9	0.7	1.9	3.3	1.4
23.	7-7	6-5	85	1.1	2.1	1.0	2.1	2.9	0.8
24.	7-9	5-2	67	1.0	1.6	0.6	1.6	2.3	0.7
25.	6-10	6-7	97	1.0	1.7	0.7	1.7	2.8	1.1
26.	7-3	5-4	73	0.0	1.3	1.3	1.3	2.4	1.1
27.	7-1	5-11	84	0.0	1.7	1.7	1.7	2.3	0.6

* CA, Chronological Age; MA, Mental Age; I.Q., Intelligence Quotient; FRGS, First Reading Grade Score; SRGS, Second Reading Grade Score; G, Gain; TRGS, Third Reading Grade Score.

children was 7 years and 9 months and the mean mental age was 6 years and 7 months. The mean of the intelligence quotient scores was 91.81.

The mean of the first reading grade scores was 1.26; the mean of the second was 1.99. The gain was 0.73. During the three and one-half months period, 25 of the 27 children made gains of four months or more and seven children gained one year or more. The range of gains was 0.1 to 1.7. The gains were significant at the .01 level of confidence(t=12.17).

The mean of the third reading grade scores was 3.13. The mean of the gains during the second three and one-half months' period was 1.14. The range of the gains was 0.1 to 3.0. Eighteen pupils gained 1.0 or more and only one gained less than 0.4. The gain of 1.14 was significant at the .01 level of confidence(t=10.36).

In Table VII data for the experimental group third grade for each of the two periods of self-directive dramatization are given. For this group the mean chronological age was 8 years and 4 months; the mean mental age was 7 years and 4 months; and the mean intelligence score, 88.12.

The mean reading score for the first reading test was 2.17. The mean of the second reading test was 2.74 and the mean gain, 0.57. During the period, 10 children gained one or more years in reading achievement, while 4 children made scores two or more months lower than their previous score. Eighteen children made gains of 0.4 or more during the three and one-half months of the period. The gain was significant at the .01 level of confidence(t=4.75).

During the second period the group made a mean gain of 0.61, from 2.74 to 3.35. The score of one child was 0.1 lower at the end of the period than at the beginning. The score of one child did not change.

TABLE VII

READING GRADE SCORES OF EXPERIMENTAL GROUP GRADE THREE BEFORE AND AFTER THE TWO SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION PERIODS

	FIRST DRAMATIZATION PERIOD						SECOND DRAMATIZATION PERIOD		
PUPIL NUMBER	CA*	MA*	I.Q.*	FRGS*	SRGS*	G*	SRGS*	TRGS*	G*
1.	8-3	6-9	82	3.6	3.4	-0.2	3.4	3.7	0.3
2.	8-3	7-7	92	2.9	2.3	-0.6	2.3	3.5	1.2
3.	8-1	8-6	105	2.6	2.7	0.1	2.7	3.9	1.2
4.	8-4	9-3	111	2.5	3.5	1.0	3.5	5.0	1.5
5.	8-4	6-2	74	2.5	3.8	1.3	3.8	4.1	0.3
6.	8-5	7-3	86	2.5	2.9	0.4	2.9	4.0	1.1
7.	8-3	6-10	83	2.5	3.5	1.0	3.5	4.2	0.7
8.	8-7	9-3	108	2.4	3.6	1.2	3.6	3.8	0.2
9.	8-0	7-8	96	2.3	3.5	1.2	3.5	3.8	0.3
10.	8-7	6-10	80	2.3	2.3	0.0	2.3	2.7	0.4
11.	8-11	9-0	101	2.3	3.0	0.7	3.0	3.6	0.6
12.	8-9	7-2	82	2.3	1.7	-0.6	1.7	3.2	1.5
13.	8-7	7-9	91	2.3	2.1	-0.2	2.1	2.8	0.7
14.	8-2	8-1	99	2.2	3.3	1.1	3.3	3.9	0.6
15.	8-9	7-10	90	2.0	3.2	1.2	3.2	3.4	0.2
16.	8-3	7-9	94	2.0	3.2	1.2	3.2	3.7	0.5
17.	8-4	7-4	88	2.0	2.6	0.6	2.6	2.8	0.2
18.	8-3	7-3	76	1.8	2.1	0.3	2.1	2.7	0.6
19.	8-0	6-2	77	1.7	1.7	0.0	1.7	3.1	1.4
20.	8-3	9-0	109	1.7	2.9	1.2	2.9	3.0	0.1
21.	8-8	6-5	74	1.7	2.7	1.0	2.7	2.6	-0.1
22.	8-7	6-4	74	1.7	2.1	0.4	2.1	2.7	0.6
23.	8-4	7-3	87	1.6	2.1	0.5	2.1	2.3	0.2
24.	8-7	6-10	80	1.5	2.4	0.9	2.4	2.4	0.0
25.	8-2	5-2	64	1.5	2.0	0.5	2.0	2.9	0.9

* CA, Chronological Age; MA, Mental Age; I.Q., Intelligence Quotient; FRGS, First Reading Grade Score; SRGS, Second Reading Grade Score; G, Gain; TRGS, Third Reading Grade Score.

The mean gain was significant at the .01 level of confidence(t=4.69).

For each of the two periods for the experimental group fourth grade, data are presented in Table VIII. The mean chronological age and mental age for this group were 9 years and 6 months and 9 years and 4 months respectively. The mean intelligence quotient was 98.31, which was the highest mean intelligence quotient possessed by any of the four experimental groups.

On the first reading test, the mean for the group was 3.39. The mean reading grade score for the second test was 3.82, for a gain of 0.43. Four children made lower scores, varying in amount from 0.2 to 1.0, on this test than on the previous test. The gains ranged from 0.1 to 1.6. Sixteen children gained four or more months during the period of three and one-half months. The gain of 0.43 was significant at the .01 level of confidence(t=4.30).

During the second self-directive dramatization period, the mean reading grade score increased from 3.82 to 4.24, the mean gain being 0.42. Again several children, five in this case, made a lower score on the test at the end of the period than they had made on the test at the beginning of the period. One child had a lower score at the end of the second period than he had at the beginning of the first period. The range of gains was 0.1 to 2.0. As during the first period, 16 children gained four or more months during the period. The gain was significant at the .01 level of confidence(t=3.82).

Gains made in reading by experimental and control groups during the first self-directive dramatization period. Table IX shows the gains made in reading grade scores by the second grade children in the experimental group and the control group during the first self-directive drama-

TABLE VIII

READING GRADE SCORES OF EXPERIMENTAL GROUP
GRADE FOUR BEFORE AND AFTER THE TWO
SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION PERIODS

	FIRST DRAMATIZATION PERIOD						SECOND DRAMATIZATION PERIOD		
PUPIL NUMBER	CA*	MA*	I.Q.*	FRGS*	SRGS*	G*	SRGS*	TRGS*	G*
1.	9-2	11-4	124	5.6	6.4	0.8	6.4	6.1	-0.3
2.	8-11	9-6	106	4.7	5.9	1.2	5.9	6.1	0.2
3.	9-5	10-10	115	4.6	6.1	1.5	6.1	5.9	-0.2
4.	9-3	12-5	135	4.4	4.9	0.5	4.9	5.9	1.0
5.	9-7	9-8	101	4.1	4.6	0.5	4.6	4.8	0.2
6.	9-7	9-4	97	4.0	3.0	-1.0	3.0	4.2	1.2
7.	9-4	10-8	114	4.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	5.0	1.0
8.	9-6	10-0	105	3.8	4.1	0.3	4.1	4.6	0.5
9.	10-3	9-2	90	3.6	4.7	1.1	4.7	5.0	0.3
10.	9-8	10-8	110	3.5	4.4	0.9	4.4	5.6	1.2
11.	8-11	7-11	88	3.3	3.5	0.2	3.5	4.1	0.6
12.	9-3	9-5	102	3.3	3.5	0.2	3.5	4.2	0.7
13.	10-8	8-11	84	3.3	3.1	-0.2	3.1	3.0	-0.1
14.	9-4	10-2	109	3.2	3.7	0.5	3.7	3.5	-0.2
15.	9-9	7-4	71	3.1	4.7	1.6	4.7	3.8	-0.9
16.	9-3	8-11	96	3.1	3.7	0.6	3.7	4.3	0.6
17.	9-4	9-7	103	3.0	2.8	-0.2	2.8	3.3	0.5
18.	10-3	9-11	97	2.9	3.4	0.4	3.4	4.5	1.1
19.	11-9	9-11	88	2.9	2.8	-0.1	2.8	4.8	2.0
20.	10-1	9-2	91	2.8	2.8	0.0	2.8	2.8	0.0
21.	9-1	8-4	91	2.8	3.0	0.2	3.0	3.2	0.2
22.	9-0	9-6	106	2.8	3.3	0.5	3.3	3.8	0.5
23.	9-2	8-9	96	2.8	2.9	0.1	2.9	3.4	0.5
24.	9-11	8-3	83	2.8	3.4	0.6	3.4	3.6	0.2
25.	8-10	8-5	97	2.8	3.3	0.5	3.3	3.8	0.5
26.	9-10	9-2	93	2.8	3.1	0.3	3.1	3.2	0.1
27.	10-9	8-1	75	2.8	2.8	0.0	2.8	3.2	0.4
28.	8-10	8-4	96	2.8	3.5	0.7	3.5	4.0	0.5
29.	9-11	8-8	88	2.8	3.5	0.7	3.5	3.5	0.0

* CA, Chronological Age; MA, Mental Age; I.Q., Intelligence Quotient; FRGS, First Reading Grade Score; SRGS, Second Reading Grade Score; G, Gain; TRGS, Third Reading Grade Score.

TABLE IX

GAINS MADE IN READING BY EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS GRADE TWO DURING FIRST SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION PERIOD

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP		CONTROL GROUP		
PUPIL NUMBER	GAINS	PUPIL NUMBER	GAINS	DIFFERENCE in GAINS*
1.	0.4	1.	0.3	0.1
2.	0.6	2.	1.2	-0.6
3.	1.0	3.	1.6	-0.6
4.	1.1	4.	1.8	-0.7
5.	0.8	5.	0.9	-0.1
6.	0.6	6.	0.8	-0.2
7.	0.1	7.	0.7	-0.6
8.	0.5	8.	0.7	-0.2
9.	0.5	9.	1.6	-1.1
10.	0.3	10.	0.6	-0.3
11.	0.7	11.	0.2	0.5
12.	1.0	12.	0.7	0.3
13.	0.9	13.	0.7	0.2
14.	0.7	14.	1.0	-0.3
15.	0.5	15.	1.1	-0.6
16.	0.8	16.	0.4	0.4
17.	0.6	17.	0.9	-0.3
18.	0.4	18.	0.8	-0.4
19.	0.7	19.	0.8	-0.1
20.	0.5	20.	0.6	-0.1
21.	1.1	21.	1.1	0.0
22.	0.7	22.	0.6	0.1
23.	1.0	23.	0.5	0.5
24.	0.6	24.	0.9	-0.3
25.	0.7	25.	1.3	-0.6
26.	1.3	26.	1.3	0.0
27.	1.7	27.	2.0	-0.3

* Minus sign shows gain in favor of Control Group; other gains are in favor of Experimental Group.

tization period. As was indicated earlier in this chapter, reading tests were not administered to the first grade groups for the first self-directive dramatization period. In this table the pupil numbers and the gains made during the period are given for the experimental group in the first two columns. In the second two columns the pupil number and gains made by the control group are shown. In the difference column a negative number indicates that the control group pupil made greater gains than the experimental group pupil. A positive number indicates the opposite—that the child in the experimental group outgained his match.

During this period, the experimental group grade two made a mean gain of 0.73, and the control group, a mean gain of 0.93. In eight cases control group pupils outgained the experimental group pupils. In seven cases the experimental group children outgained those in the control group, and in two cases there were no differences in gains. The difference in gains was significant at the .01 level of confidence in favor of the control group($t=2.86$).

Table X shows the gains made by the third grade control and experimental groups and the difference in the gains. The mean gain of the control group, which was 0.88, exceeded the mean gain of the experimental group, which was 0.57, by 0.31. Fifteen of the children in the control group outgained the children in the experimental group with whom they were paired. In eight cases the scores of the experimental group children were higher than those of the control group, while in two cases there were not differences in scores. The difference in gains was significant at the .05 level of confidence in favor of the control group($t=2.38$).

The gains made in reading achievement by the experimental and control groups grade four for the first self-directive dramatization

TABLE X

GAINS MADE IN READING BY EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS GRADE THREE DURING FIRST SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION PERIOD

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP		CONTROL GROUP		
PUPIL NUMBER	GAINS	PUPIL NUMBER	GAINS	DIFFERENCE in GAINS*
1.	-0.2	1.	0.2	-0.4
2.	-0.5	2.	0.8	-1.3
3.	0.1	3.	1.2	-1.3
4.	1.0	4.	1.7	-0.7
5.	1.3	5.	0.5	0.8
6.	0.4	6.	0.4	0.0
7.	1.0	7.	0.8	0.2
8.	1.2	8.	2.0	-0.8
9.	1.2	9.	1.0	0.2
10.	0.0	10.	0.7	-0.7
11.	0.7	11.	0.7	0.0
12.	-0.6	12.	0.4	-1.0
13.	-0.2	13.	0.6	-0.8
14.	1.1	14.	0.4	0.7
15.	1.2	15.	0.8	0.4
16.	1.2	16.	1.1	0.1
17.	0.6	17.	1.9	-1.3
18.	0.3	18.	0.9	-0.6
19.	0.0	19.	1.0	-1.0
20.	1.2	20.	0.6	0.6
21.	1.0	21.	0.3	0.7
22.	0.4	22.	1.1	-0.7
23.	0.5	23.	1.1	-0.6
24.	0.9	24.	1.4	-0.5
25.	0.5	25.	0.6	-0.1

* Minus sign shows gain in favor of Control Group; other gains are in favor of Experimental Group.

period are presented in Table XI. For the experimental group the mean of the gains was 0.43 and for the control group 0.55. The difference in gains was 0.12 in favor of the control group. In 15 cases the gains of the control group exceeded those of the experimental group, while in 11 cases the experimental group pupils made greater gains than did their matches. In three cases there were no differences in gains. The difference in gains was not significant at the .10 level of confidence(t=.75).

Gains made in reading by experimental and control groups during the second dramatization period. Data concerning the reading gains made by experimental and control groups for the second self-directive dramatization period are presented in the tables in the same way as they were for the first period. The pupil numbers and reading score gains for the experimental group are presented in the first two columns. The same information is given for the control group in the third and fourth columns and the difference between the gains is shown in the fifth column. A negative number indicates that the gain of the experimental group pupil exceeded that of the control group pupil. A positive number indicates that the experimental group pupil gained more than did the control group pupil.

In Table XII data concerning reading gains of the experimental and control groups grade one are shown. The mean gain of the experimental group was 1.13 and of the control group, 0.24. The difference was 0.89 in favor of the experimental group. The gains of 23 of the pupils in the experimental group exceeded the gains made by their matches. In three cases the gains of the experimental group pupil and his match were equal. The range of the difference was 0.1 to 2.1. The difference between the means of the gains was significant at the .01 level of confidence in favor of the experimental group(t=7.42).

TABLE XI

GAINS MADE IN READING BY EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS GRADE FOUR DURING FIRST SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION PERIOD

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP		CONTROL GROUP		
PUPIL NUMBER	GAINS	PUPIL NUMBER	GAINS	DIFFERENCE in GAINS *
1.	0.8	1.	0.8	0.0
2.	1.2	2.	1.3	-0.1
3.	1.5	3.	2.3	-0.8
4.	0.5	4.	0.5	0.0
5.	0.5	5.	0.9	-0.4
6.	-1.0	6.	0.7	-1.7
7.	0.0	7.	-0.3	0.3
8.	0.3	8.	-0.5	0.8
9.	1.1	9.	-0.5	1.6
10.	0.9	10.	-0.1	1.0
11.	0.2	11.	2.6	-2.4
12.	0.2	12.	1.3	-1.1
13.	-0.2	13.	0.4	-0.6
14.	0.5	14.	1.5	-1.0
15.	1.6	15.	-0.2	1.8
16.	0.6	16.	0.6	0.0
17.	-0.2	17.	0.7	-0.9
18.	0.5	18.	1.4	-0.9
19.	-0.1	19.	0.1	-0.2
20.	0.0	20.	0.4	-0.4
21.	0.2	21.	0.5	-0.3
22.	0.5	22.	0.0	0.5
23.	0.1	23.	0.4	-0.3
24.	0.6	24.	0.1	0.5
25.	0.5	25.	0.0	0.5
26.	0.3	26.	0.0	0.3
27.	0.0	27.	0.1	-0.1
28.	0.7	28.	0.6	0.1
29.	0.7	29.	0.3	0.4

* Minus sign shows gain in favor of Control Group; other gains are in favor of Experimental Group.

TABLE XII

GAINS MADE IN READING BY EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS GRADE ONE DURING SECOND SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION PERIOD*

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP		CONTROL GROUP		
PUPIL NUMBER	GAINS	PUPIL NUMBER	GAINS	DIFFERENCE in GAINS**
1.	0.7	1.	-0.2	0.9
2.	0.7	2.	0.1	0.6
3.	1.1	3.	0.0	1.1
4.	0.8	4.	0.4	0.4
5.	0.4	5.	0.4	0.0
6.	0.8	6.	0.2	0.6
7.	0.8	7.	-0.1	0.9
8.	1.2	8.	0.0	1.2
9.	0.8	9.	0.3	0.5
10.	0.4	10.	0.0	0.4
11.	0.8	11.	0.3	0.5
12.	0.4	12.	-1.0	1.4
13.	1.3	13.	1.2	0.1
14.	1.9	14.	0.5	1.4
15.	1.4	15.	0.0	1.4
16.	1.7	16.	1.0	0.7
17.	1.7	17.	0.0	1.7
18.	0.0	18.	0.0	0.0
19.	1.5	19.	0.6	0.9
20.	1.8	20.	0.0	1.8
21.	2.1	21.	0.0	2.1
22.	1.3	22.	0.7	0.6
23.	2.3	23.	0.0	2.3
24.	2.1	24.	1.0	1.1
25.	1.5	25.	0.9	0.6
26.	0.0	26.	0.0	0.0

* Data not secured for Grade One during First Self-Directive Dramatization Period.

** Minus sign shows gain in favor of Control Group; other gains are in favor of Experimental Group.

Data concerning reading gains for experimental and control groups for grade two are presented in Table XIII. For this grade the means of the reading score gains were 1.14 for the experimental group and 0.32 for the control group. The difference between the means was 0.82, with the greater gain having been made by the experimental group. Twenty-three pupils in the experimental group made greater gains than did the pupils with whom they were matched, two pupils made smaller gains, and two made the same gains. The difference between the means of the gains was significant at the .01 level of confidence in favor of the experimental group(t=6.31).

In Table XIV data concerning reading gains for the third grade are presented. The experimental group made a mean gain of 0.61 while the control group had a mean score which was 0.10 lower on the test at the end of the period than on the test at the beginning of the period. The mean difference was 0.71. Fourteen of the control group pupils had a lower score at the end of the period than at the beginning of the period, seven had a higher score, and two had the same scores. All of the experimental group pupils except two had a higher score at the end of the period than at the beginning. One of the two had a lower score, the other, the same score.

Twenty-two of the experimental group pupils outgained their matches; three gained less than the control pupils with whom they were matched. The difference between the means of the gains was significant at the .01 level of confidence in favor of the experimental group(t=5.38).

Table XV shows the reading gains made by the fourth grade during the period. The experimental group's mean gain was 0.42; that of the control group was -0.12. The mean gain of the experimental group exceeded

TABLE XIII

GAINS MADE IN READING BY EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS GRADE TWO DURING SECOND SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION PERIOD

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP		CONTROL GROUP		
PUPIL NUMBER	GAINS	PUPIL NUMBER	GAINS	DIFFERENCE in GAINS*
1.	3.0	1.	0.9	2.1
2.	1.8	2.	0.0	1.8
3.	1.2	3.	-0.1	1.3
4.	0.1	4.	-0.3	0.4
5.	1.4	5.	-0.2	1.6
6.	1.5	6.	0.1	1.4
7.	0.4	7.	0.4	0.0
8.	1.0	8.	0.3	0.7
9.	1.2	9.	-0.3	1.5
10.	2.0	10.	0.6	1.4
11.	1.5	11.	0.0	1.5
12.	0.7	12.	0.2	0.5
13.	0.6	13.	0.9	-0.3
14.	0.8	14.	-0.1	0.9
15.	1.1	15.	0.1	1.0
16.	1.4	16.	1.1	0.3
17.	1.3	17.	0.1	1.2
18.	1.0	18.	0.7	0.3
19.	1.2	19.	-0.1	1.3
20.	1.0	20.	0.5	0.5
21.	0.8	21.	0.6	0.2
22.	1.4	22.	0.1	1.3
23.	0.8	23.	1.2	-0.4
24.	0.7	24.	0.0	0.7
25.	1.1	25.	1.1	0.0
26.	1.1	26.	0.6	0.5
27.	0.6	27.	0.3	0.3

* Minus sign shows gain in favor of Control Group; other gains are in favor of Experimental Group.

TABLE XIV

GAINS MADE IN READING BY EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS GRADE THREE DURING SECOND SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION PERIOD

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP		CONTROL GROUP		
PUPIL NUMBER	GAINS	PUPIL NUMBER	GAINS	DIFFERENCE in GAINS*
1.	0.3	1.	-0.5	0.8
2.	1.2	2.	0.4	0.8
3.	1.2	3.	-0.4	1.6
4.	1.5	4.	-0.6	2.1
5.	0.3	5.	0.0	0.3
6.	1.1	6.	0.4	0.7
7.	0.7	7.	0.4	0.3
8.	0.2	8.	-0.9	1.1
9.	0.3	9.	0.2	0.1
10.	0.4	10.	0.7	-0.3
11.	0.6	11.	-0.1	0.7
12.	1.5	12.	-0.2	1.7
13.	0.7	13.	-0.2	0.8
14.	0.6	14.	-0.2	0.8
15.	0.2	15.	-0.3	0.5
16.	0.5	16.	-0.7	1.2
17.	0.2	17.	-0.3	0.5
18.	0.6	18.	0.2	0.4
19.	1.4	19.	0.7	0.7
20.	0.1	20.	-0.4	0.5
21.	-0.1	21.	0.1	-0.2
22.	0.6	22.	-0.6	1.2
23.	0.2	23.	0.3	-0.1
24.	0.0	24.	-0.4	0.4
25.	0.9	25.	0.0	0.9

* Minus sign shows gain in favor of Control Group; other gains are in favor of Experimental Group.

TABLE XV

GAINS MADE IN READING BY EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS GRADE FOUR DURING SECOND SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION PERIOD

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP		CONTROL GROUP		
PUPIL NUMBER	GAINS	PUPIL NUMBER	GAINS	DIFFERENCE in GAINS *
1.	-0.3	1.	-1.6	1.3
2.	0.2	2.	0.2	0.0
3.	-0.2	3.	0.1	-0.3
4.	1.0	4.	-0.2	1.2
5.	0.2	5.	-1.2	1.4
6.	1.2	6.	0.6	0.6
7.	1.0	7.	-0.6	1.6
8.	0.5	8.	1.0	-0.5
9.	0.3	9.	0.4	-0.1
10.	1.2	10.	0.6	0.6
11.	0.6	11.	-1.6	2.2
12.	0.7	12.	-0.6	1.3
13.	-0.1	13.	0.6	-0.7
14.	-0.2	14.	-0.7	0.5
15.	-0.9	15.	0.3	-1.2
16.	0.6	16.	0.6	0.0
17.	0.5	17.	0.0	0.5
18.	1.1	18.	-0.8	1.9
19.	2.0	19.	-0.3	2.3
20.	0.0	20.	-0.4	0.4
21.	0.2	21.	-0.4	0.6
22.	0.5	22.	0.0	0.5
23.	0.5	23.	0.0	0.5
24.	0.2	24.	-0.1	0.3
25.	0.5	25.	0.3	0.2
26.	0.1	26.	-0.1	0.2
27.	0.4	27.	0.6	-0.2
28.	0.5	28.	0.4	0.1
29.	0.0	29.	-0.6	0.6

* Minus sign shows gain in favor of Control Group; other gains are in favor of Experimental Group.

that of the control group by 0.54. Five pupils in the experimental group had lower scores at the end of the period than at the beginning. There was a decrease in the scores of 14 of the control group pupils.

In six cases the control group pupils outgained the pupils with whom they were matched. In 22 cases, experimental group pupils outscored their matches, and in one case there was no difference in gains. The difference between the means of the gains was significant at the .01 level of confidence in favor of the experimental group(t=4.15).

Gains made in reading by experimental and control groups during the first and second dramatization periods. The differences in gains made during both the first and the second self-directive dramatization periods by the experimental and control groups are presented in the same way as were the differences in gains for each one of the two periods. In each table, the experimental group pupil number and gain, the control group pupil number and gain, and the difference in gains are presented. No data for the first grade is presented, since tests were not administered to this group at the beginning of the first period.

Gains made in reading by experimental and control groups grade two are presented in Table XVI. The mean of the gains for the experimental group was 1.87. The mean for the control group was 1.25. The difference was 0.62 in favor of the experimental group. All pupils in both groups made gains during the two periods. For the experimental group the range was 0.5 to 3.4 and for the control group, 0.2 to 2.4. All pupils but one in the experimental group gained one or more years during the two three and one-half months periods. Nineteen of the pupils in the control group gained one year or more during the same period of time.

TABLE XVI

GAINS MADE IN READING BY EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS GRADE TWO DURING FIRST AND SECOND SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION PERIODS

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP		CONTROL GROUP		
PUPIL NUMBER	GAINS	PUPIL NUMBER	GAINS	DIFFERENCE in GAINS *
1.	3.4	1.	1.2	2.2
2.	2.4	2.	1.2	1.2
3.	2.2	3.	1.5	0.7
4.	1.2	4.	1.5	-0.3
5.	2.2	5.	0.7	1.5
6.	2.1	6.	0.9	1.2
7.	0.5	7.	1.1	-0.6
8.	1.5	8.	1.0	0.5
9.	1.7	9.	1.3	0.4
10.	2.3	10.	1.2	1.1
11.	2.2	11.	0.2	2.0
12.	1.7	12.	0.9	0.8
13.	1.5	13.	1.6	-0.1
14.	1.5	14.	0.9	0.6
15.	1.6	15.	1.2	0.4
16.	2.2	16.	1.5	0.7
17.	1.9	17.	1.0	0.9
18.	1.4	18.	1.5	-0.1
19.	1.9	19.	0.7	1.2
20.	1.5	20.	1.1	0.4
21.	1.9	21.	1.7	0.2
22.	2.1	22.	0.7	1.4
23.	1.8	23.	1.7	0.1
24.	1.3	24.	0.9	0.4
25.	1.8	25.	2.4	-0.6
26.	2.4	26.	1.9	0.5
27.	2.3	27.	2.3	0.0

* Minus sign shows gain in favor of Control Group; other gains are in favor of Experimental Group.

In 21 cases experimental group pupils gained more than their matches. In five cases control group pupils gained more than the pupils with whom they were matched and in one case there was no difference in scores. The difference in the means of the gains was significant at the .01 level of confidence in favor of the experimental group(t=4.43).

In Table XVII data concerning reading gains made by experimental and control groups grade three are presented. The mean of the gains for the two periods made by the experimental group was 1.18. The mean of the gains of the control group was 0.79. The difference was 0.39 in favor of the experimental group. All pupils in the experimental group made gains in reading during the two periods. Fifteen of the pupils in this group gained one year or more. In the control group, gains were made by all but one pupil. Ten pupils in the control group gained one year or more. The range of gains for the experimental group was 0.1 to 2.5. For the control group the range was -0.3 to 1.7. Nineteen of the experimental group pupils outgained their matches. Six of the pupils in the control group had greater gains than did the pupils with whom they were matched. The difference in means of the gains was significant at the .02 level of confidence in favor of the experimental group(t=2.79).

In Table XVIII data is presented concerning the gains in reading made by the experimental and control groups grade four. The mean of the gains made by the experimental group was 0.85. The mean of the gains of the control group was 0.43. The difference of the means was 0.42 in favor of the experimental group.

Only one pupil in the experimental group had a lower score at the end of the second period than at the beginning of the first period. All others in the experimental group made gains of 0.2 or more except for one

TABLE XVII

GAINS MADE IN READING BY EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS GRADE THREE DURING FIRST AND SECOND SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION PERIODS

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP		CONTROL GROUP		
PUPIL NUMBER	GAINS	PUPIL NUMBER	GAINS	DIFFERENCE in GAINS*
1.	0.1	1.	-0.3	0.4
2.	0.6	2.	1.2	-0.6
3.	1.6	3.	0.8	0.8
4.	2.5	4.	1.1	1.4
5.	1.6	5.	0.5	1.1
6.	1.5	6.	0.8	0.7
7.	1.7	7.	1.2	0.5
8.	1.4	8.	1.3	0.1
9.	1.5	9.	1.2	0.3
10.	0.4	10.	1.4	-1.0
11.	1.3	11.	0.6	0.7
12.	0.9	12.	0.2	0.7
13.	0.5	13.	0.4	0.1
14.	1.7	14.	0.2	1.5
15.	1.4	15.	0.5	0.9
16.	1.7	16.	0.4	1.3
17.	0.8	17.	1.6	-0.8
18.	0.9	18.	1.1	-0.2
19.	1.4	19.	1.7	-0.3
20.	1.3	20.	0.2	1.1
21.	0.9	21.	0.4	0.5
22.	1.0	22.	0.5	0.5
23.	0.7	23.	1.4	-0.7
24.	0.9	24.	0.7	0.2
25.	1.4	25.	0.6	0.8

* Minus sign shows gain in favor of Control Group; other gains are in favor of Experimental Group.

TABLE XVIII

GAINS MADE IN READING BY EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS GRADE FOUR DURING FIRST AND SECOND SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION PERIODS

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP		CONTROL GROUP		
PUPIL NUMBER	GAINS	PUPIL NUMBER	GAINS	DIFFERENCE in GAINS*
1.	0.5	1.	-0.8	1.3
2.	1.4	2.	1.5	-0.1
3.	1.3	3.	2.4	-1.1
4.	1.5	4.	0.3	1.2
5.	0.7	5.	-0.3	1.0
6.	0.2	6.	1.3	-1.1
7.	1.0	7.	-0.9	1.9
8.	0.8	8.	0.5	0.3
9.	1.4	9.	-0.1	1.5
10.	2.1	10.	0.5	1.6
11.	0.8	11.	1.0	-0.2
12.	0.9	12.	0.7	0.2
13.	-0.3	13.	1.0	-1.3
14.	0.3	14.	0.8	-0.5
15.	0.7	15.	0.1	0.6
16.	1.2	16.	1.2	0.0
17.	0.3	17.	0.7	-0.4
18.	1.6	18.	0.6	1.0
19.	1.9	19.	-0.2	2.1
20.	0.0	20.	0.0	0.0
21.	0.4	21.	0.1	0.3
22.	1.0	22.	0.0	1.0
23.	0.6	23.	0.4	0.2
24.	0.8	24.	0.0	0.8
25.	1.0	25.	0.3	0.7
26.	0.4	26.	-0.1	0.5
27.	0.4	27.	0.7	-0.3
28.	1.2	28.	1.0	0.2
29.	0.5	29.	-0.3	0.8

* Minus sign shows gain in favor of Control Group; other gains are in favor of Experimental Group.

pupil who had the same score. The largest gain was 2.1. Seven of the control group pupils had a lower score at the end of the two periods than at the beginning. Three pupils showed no change in scores, while 19 made gains. The largest gain was 2.4.

In eight cases the control group pupils gained more than the experimental group pupils. In two cases there were no differences in gains, and in 19 cases the gains of the experimental group pupils were larger than those of the control group pupils. The difference in the means of the gains was significant at the .02 level of confidence in favor of the experimental group($t=2.63$).

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF READING ACHIEVEMENT

Data related to progress in reading in the experimental and control groups in a regular classroom have been discussed in this chapter. The two questions of concern are as listed:

1. Can significant gains in reading be achieved with groups of culturally disadvantaged elementary school children through the use of self-directive dramatization in the reading program in a regular classroom?
2. Can significantly greater gains be achieved with groups of culturally disadvantaged elementary school children through the use of self-directive dramatization than through the use of methods involving primarily the reading of one or two basic readers in small groups or in the whole class in a regular classroom?

CONCLUSIONS

In answer to the first question, the following data were secured:

1. During the first self-directive dramtization period, the experimental group grade one was not tested in reading. The experimental group grade two gained 0.73 in reading, which was significant at the .01 level of confidence; the experimental group grade three gained 0.57 in reading, which was significant at the .01 level of confidence; the experimental group grade four gained 0.43 in reading, which was significant at the .01 level of confidence.
2. During the second dramatization period, the experimental group grade one gained 1.13 in reading, which was significant at the .01 level of confidence; the experimental group grade two gained 1.14 in reading, which was significant at the .01 level of confidence; the experimental group grade three gained 0.61 in reading, which was significant at the .01 level of confidence; the experimental group grade four gained 0.42 in reading, which was significant at the .01 level of confidence.

In answer to the second question concerning the relative achievement of experimental and control groups, the following data were secured:

1. During the first dramatization period, the experimental and control groups grade one were not tested in reading; the experimental group grade two gained 0.73 in reading and the control group gained 0.93. This difference in gains was significant at the .01 level of confidence in favor of the control group. The experimental group grade

three gained 0.57 in reading and the control group gained 0.88. This difference in gains was significant at the 0.5 level of confidence in favor of the control group. The experimental group grade four gained 0.43 in reading and the control group gained 0.55. This difference in gains was not significant at the .10 level of confidence.

2. During the second dramatization period the experimental group grade one gained 1.13 in reading and the control group grade one gained 0.24. This difference in the mean gains was significant at the .01 level of confidence in favor of the experimental group. The experimental group grade two gained 1.14 in reading and the control group gained 0.32. This difference in the mean gains was significant at the .01 level of confidence in favor of the experimental group. The experimental group grade three gained 0.61 in reading while the gain of the control group was -0.10. This difference in the mean gains was significant at the .01 level of confidence in favor of the experimental group. The experimental group grade four gained 0.42 in reading and the control group gained -0.12. This difference in the mean gains was significant at the .01 level of confidence in favor of the experimental group.

3. During the first and second dramatization period the total gain of the experimental group grade one in reading remained as it was in the second period. (Grade one was

not tested in reading during the first period.) The difference of 0.89 in the mean gains was significant at the .01 level of confidence in favor of the experimental group. The total gain of the experimental group grade two in reading was 1.87; the total gain of the control group grade two in reading was 1.25. The difference in gains was significant at the .01 level of confidence in favor of the experimental group. The total gain of the experimental group grade three in reading was 1.18; the total gain of the control group grade three in reading was .79. This difference in the mean gains was significant at the .02 level of confidence in favor of the experimental group. The total gain of the experimental group grade four in reading was 0.85; the total gain of the control group grade four in reading was 0.43. This difference in the mean gains was significant at the .02 level of confidence in favor of the experimenatal group.

It may now be concluded that significant gains in reading can be achieved with groups of culturally disadvantaged elementary school children through the use of self-directive dramatization of stories in the reading program in a regular classroom, and that significantly greater gains can be achieved with culturally disadvantaged elementary school children through the use of self-directive dramatization than through the use of methods involving primarily the reading of one or two basic readers in small groups or in the whole class in a regular classroom.

IMPLICATIONS

Progress in reading through self-directive dramatization in stories has been the question of concern in this chapter. In addition, many questions related to this subject were raised by visitors, the observers, the investigators, and the classroom teachers who worked with the study. One question uppermost in the minds of many who were interested in this study was, "Can you say that the intelligence quotient scores are reliable?" The investigators recognize that the intelligence quotient scores did not give a true indication of the mental ability of these culturally disadvantaged children. They had never taken tests of any kind. In the beginning of the year, they were so overly stimulated that they could not sit still long enough for a test to be administered as it should be. They talked continuously in an excitable way, but rarely to anyone. They never seemed to listen. However, the results of such tests were, the investigators believe, useful in selecting matches for pupils in one culturally disadvantaged class from other culturally disadvantaged classes. (It may be mentioned parenthetically that later tests show many of the intelligence quotient scores to be higher.)

There was also some concern because a pupil sometimes made a lower score on the second or third reading test than he did on the preceding one. This does not mean that the pupil was a poorer reader at the end of the period than he was at the beginning. An answer often given to this question is that it may be due to a variation in attitude or to an emotional or physical condition at the time the test was given. This may be true, but another more logical answer is that many pupils do not improve in reading by going steadily up. They reach a plateau which they cannot hold and drop back to a place where they feel more secure. Then they will again reach or go beyond the plateau which they did not previously hold. The investigators believe that when children are

permitted to select their own reading materials, as was done in self-directive dramatization, they become more adept at selecting materials to fit their needs than the teacher who tells them what to read. They often will find security more rapidly and reach an original or higher plateau in much less time than children who have stories assigned to them.

The question, "When do children learn the word recognition skills in self-directive dramatization?" is often asked. These children, just as any other children, were taught the word recognition skills according to individual needs. The word recognition skills are considered to be a part of learning to read. As the children read in their groups, the needs of each child were noted and help was given at an appropiate time.

While the experiment was in progress, materials was one big question uppermost in the minds of the investigators and the teachers. Many different reading materials were brought into the classroom. As new books were brought in, those already in the room were kept there. In the beginning, the children treated books as they treated strangers. They wanted no part of them. As time passed, the children actually clapped their hands when new books were brought into the room. Then it was observed that after they looked at the new books, they would go back and get a book that had been in the room earlier. This enabled the investigators, the observers, and the teachers to reach the following conclusions:

1. It was important that all books used by the children be kept in their rooms all the time. (This was the condition under which self-directive dramatization of stories was done.)

2. When the second and third grade children began reading books, they seemed starved for the Mother Goose rhymes and for such stories as "The Gingerbread Boy," and "The Three Pigs," and continued to return to them at different times during the year. Later, after other books had been in the rooms for a while and had been talked about, they began to show an interest in reading those books. By the end of the year, easy science and social studies books were of interest to them. Therefore, it is recommended that more than one kind of reading material be placed in the classroom. The children definitely liked books with large print and books easy enough to be read by them. They did show a preference for selecting the stories that they read.

Because these children, in the beginning, were not able to work and play together and moved so slowly into self-directive dramatization of stories, the writers feel that two years' work should have been done with them, with the testing being done only in the second year. However, because of the progress they made, those who worked with the experiment concluded that the use of self-directive dramatization of stories for the purpose of bringing about progress in reading and changing the self-concept of the pupils is a desirable way of dealing with boys and girls in the classroom.

CHAPTER IV

SELF-CONCEPT

Answers to the following questions on self-concept are reported in this chapter:

1. Can favorable changes in the self-concept of culturally disadvantaged elementary school children be brought about through the use of self-directive dramatization in the reading program in a regular classroom?
2. Will there be a correlation between gains in reading achievement and changes in self-concept on the part of groups of culturally disadvantaged elementary school children with whom self-directive dramatization in reading is used in a regular classroom?

SELF-CONCEPT AS USED IN THIS STUDY

Self-concept may be said to involve what a child thinks he is, what he thinks he can do, what he thinks he cannot do. The assumption has been made that a child's behavior reflects what he thinks about himself, how he feels about himself, and his goals in learning. It is further assumed that a positive concept is conducive to progress in reading, while a negative concept is not.

Because reading achievement in relation to self-concept was considered in this study, an example is presented here as an explanation of what is meant by a self-concept that may not be conducive to pro-

gress in reading. When the teacher in grade two asked a boy if he would like to move a chair near her and get help with reading, he said in an angry voice, "I don't want to set in the chair and I don't want to learn to read. That stuff's hard." Because of such statements made by this pupil at different times previous to the self-directive dramatization period, the teacher and the observer considered the following questions as being applicable to the behavior and thinking of the pupil:

1. Does he refuse to do things because he thinks he does not do them well?
2. Does he withdraw from the teacher?

No attempt was made to determine the degree to which a particular behavior inhibited progress in reading.

SELF-CONCEPT QUESTIONS

The self-concept questions which were used in observing and checking the behaviors of the pupils included in this study are as follows:

I. Association with Others

1. Does he withdraw from the teacher?
2. Does he withdraw from the children?
3. Does he withdraw from the teacher and the children?
4. Does he want to be with the teacher all the time instead of with the children?
5. Does he try to gain favor by agreeing, by giving gifts, or through flattery?
6. Does he give one the feeling that he is shy--talks almost in a whisper, tiptoes about the room, etc.?

II. Attitude toward Himself

1. Does he need praise in order to complete his work?
2. Does he "brag" about what he can do?
3. Does he express opinions about himself?
4. Does he refuse to do things because he thinks he does not do them well?

III. Attitude toward Others

1. Does he refuse to give help if a child asks for it?
2. Is he unkind to a new child, or to any child?
3. Does he show signs of being jealous - of a child's new clothes, or praise given another child?
4. Does he want to do all the talking?
5. Does he refuse to listen when others talk?

IV. When things Do Not Go Right

1. Is he eager to "tell on" another child?
2. Does he refuse to apologize if he hurts a child's feelings?
3. Does he blame someone because he does something wrong?
4. When his feelings are hurt, does he hold a grudge?
5. Does he "pout" a long time when something displeases him?
6. Does he act impulsively - hit someone, cry?
7. Does he argue with children?
8. Does he demand that other children give him what he wants?
9. Does he get angry when his suggestions are not accepted?

V. In Daily Routine

1. Does he want to be first in everything-getting a drink, giving an answer?
2. Is he unwilling to take turns?
3. Does he do things to attract attention-make faces, talk loudly, "steal the show?"
4. Does he refuse to make contributions to classroom activities?
5. Does he often fail to finish what he starts?
6. Does he refuse to share things with the children?
7. Does he try to "boss" the children?

CHECKING THE SELF-CONCEPT QUESTIONS

The self-concept questions were used as a guide to what to look for in the behavior of each pupil in each of the four experimental grade groups. It should be noted that all questions are stated in the form of negative behaviors and that most of the behaviors are obvious, thus removing much of the possibility of the checking being too judgmental on the part of the classroom teachers and the observers.

For a period of about three weeks prior to the beginning of the first self-directive dramatization period, the behaviors of the pupils were observed by those responsible for checking the self-concept questions. A number was used for a pupil instead of the pupil's name. Each question that was considered as being applicable to the behavior of a particular pupil was checked with an "x" under the pupil's number. The "x" meant "yes" this question was applicable to this pupil. If a pupil did not have "x" by a question under his number, he was considered as being checked "no" on the question. Some pupils were checked

on more questions than others. (Each pupil's number for each grade remains the same in the reading and self-concept tables throughout this report.)

Following the self-directive dramatization period, the self-concept questions were again checked for each pupil to determine if there was a loss of checks on any of the questions, or if any additional negative behaviors were acquired during the dramatization period. A loss of checks meant a gain in self-concept.

The checks following the first self-directive dramatization period were used for the "before" time in the second dramatization period. The final checking of the questions followed immediately after the second dramatization period.

CHANGES IN SELF-CONCEPT

One of the objectives of the study was to learn if favorable changes in the self-concept of culturally disadvantaged elementary school children could be brought about through the use of self-directive dramatization in the reading program. The number of checks on the self-concept questions before and immediately after the self-directive dramatization periods led to the inference that changes did occur in the self-concept of the pupils. The data in Tables XIX through XXII indicate that the pupils were checked on fewer self-concept questions following the self-directive dramatization periods than they were preceding the dramatization periods. This indicates a gain in self-concept for the pupils.

Changes in grade one. Table XIX shows that the total number of self-concept questions on which twenty-six pupils in grade one were checked preceding the second dramatization period was 519 and that the total number of self-concept questions on which all of these

TABLE XIX

NUMBER OF SELF-CONCEPT CHECKS GRADE ONE
BEFORE AND AFTER THE SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION PERIOD*

PUPIL NUMBER	BEFORE	AFTER	DECREASE**
1.	23	4	19
2.	27	14	13
3.	24	12	12
4.	16	3	13
5.	25	16	9
6.	22	11	11
7.	26	11	15
8.	17	6	11
9.	27	16	11
10.	25	6	19
11.	27	14	13
12.	16	3	13
13.	18	5	13
14.	9	1	8
15.	26	14	12
16.	8	2	6
17.	24	9	15
18.	11	4	7
19.	13	6	7
20.	23	10	13
21.	8	2	6
22.	14	4	10
23.	21	1	20
24.	15	4	11
25.	28	13	15
26.	26	13	13
TOTAL	519	204	315

* Data not secured for Grade One during First Dramatization Period.
** A decrease in the number of Self-Concept Checks means a gain for the pupil.

same pupils were checked immediately after the self-directive dramatization period was 204. (Because first grade pupils were not tested in reading at the beginning of the year, there was only one dramatization period for them.) The decrease in the number of checks on the self-concept questions was 315. The over-all percentage decrease was 60.7.

Changes in grade two. Table XX shows that the total number of self-concept questions on which twenty-seven pupils in grade two were checked preceding the first self-directive dramatization period was 480 and that the total number of self-concept questions on which these pupils were checked immediately after the self-directive dramatization period was 289. The decrease in the number of checks on the self-concept questions for the first dramatization period was 191. The over-all percentage decrease for the first dramatization period was 39.8. The total number of self-concept questions on which these same pupils were checked preceding the second self-directive dramatization period was 289; the total number of self-concept questions on which these pupils were checked immediately after the second self-directive dramatization period was 82. The decrease in the number of checks on the self-concept questions for the second dramatization was 207. The over-all percentage decrease for the second dramatization period was 71.6.

Changes in grade three. Table XXI shows that the total number of self-concept questions on which twenty-five pupils in grade three were checked preceding the first self-directive dramatization period was 318 and that the total number of self-concept questions on which these puils were checked immediately after the self-directive dramatization period was 209. The decrease in the number of checks on the self-concept questions for the first dramatization period was 109. The over-all percentage decrease for the first dramatization period was 34.2.

TABLE XX

NUMBER OF SELF-CONCEPT CHECKS GRADE TWO BEFORE AND AFTER THE SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION PERIODS

FIRST DRAMATIZATION PERIOD				SECOND DRAMATIZATION PERIOD			
PUPIL NUMBER	BEFORE	AFTER	DECREASE	PUPIL NUMBER	BEFORE	AFTER	DECREASE
1.	18	10	8	1.	10	0	10
2.	10	6	4	2.	6	2	4
3.	22	15	7	3.	15	0	15
4.	19	11	8	4.	11	1	10
5.	22	17	5	5.	17	11	6
6.	24	18	6	6.	18	11	7
7.	17	10	7	7.	10	3	7
8.	17	7	10	8.	7	2	5
9.	15	9	6	9.	9	0	9
10.	26	24	2	10.	24	7	17
11.	22	13	9	11.	13	1	12
12.	18	7	11	12.	7	3	4
13.	21	10	11	13.	10	0	10
14.	6	2	4	14.	2	0	2
15.	14	10	4	15.	10	1	9
16.	12	8	4	16.	8	3	5
17.	11	4	7	17.	4	1	3
18.	13	9	4	18.	9	2	7
19.	14	5	9	19.	5	0	5
20.	19	11	8	20.	11	1	10
21.	25	15	10	21.	15	5	10
22.	18	6	12	22.	6	2	4
23.	12	6	6	23.	6	1	5
24.	25	18	7	24.	18	9	9
25.	23	15	8	25.	15	6	9
26.	15	12	3	26.	12	8	4
27.	22	11	11	27.	11	2	9
TOTAL	480	289	191		289	82	207

TABLE XXI

NUMBER OF SELF-CONCEPT CHECKS GRADE THREE BEFORE AND AFTER THE SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION PERIODS

FIRST DRAMATIZATION PERIOD				SECOND DRAMATIZATION PERIOD			
PUPIL NUMBER	BEFORE	AFTER	DECREASE	PUPIL NUMBER	BEFORE	AFTER	DECREASE
1.	15	8	7	1.	8	5	3
2.	6	4	2	2.	4	0	4
3.	6	2	4	3.	2	0	2
4.	18	7	11	4.	7	2	5
5.	13	7	6	5.	7	3	4
6.	6	4	2	6.	4	1	3
7.	0	2*	-2	7.	2	1	1
8.	20	9	11	8.	9	4	5
9.	8	3	5	9.	3	1	2
10.	21	15	6	10.	15	10	5
11.	10	8	2	11.	8	4	4
12.	21	16	5	12.	16	7	9
13.	17	13	4	13.	13	4	9
14.	5	4	1	14.	4	1	3
15.	3	1	2	15.	1	0	1
16.	14	7	7	16.	7	3	4
17.	16	13	3	17.	13	8	5
18.	8	5	3	18.	5	2	3
19.	18	12	6	19.	12	9	3
20.	12	5	7	20.	5	0	5
21.	16	12	4	21.	12	7	5 *
22.	17	14	3	22.	14	8	6
23.	18	12	6	23.	12	7	5
24.	23	21	2	24.	21	14	7
25.	7	5	2	25.	5	3	2
TOTAL	318	209	109		209	104	105

* Note that Pupil No. 7 was checked pn two Self-Concept Questions at the end of the First Dramatization Period.

The total number of self-concept questions on which these same pupils were checked preceding the second dramatization was 209; the total number of self-concept questions on which these pupils were checked immediately after the second dramatization period was 104. The decrease in the number of checks on the self-concept questions for the second dramatization period was 105. The over-all percentage decrease for the second dramatization period was 50.2.

Changes in grade four. Table XXII shows that the total number of self-concept questions on which twenty-nine pupils in grade four were checked preceding the first self-directive dramatization period was 558 and that the total number of self-concept questions on which these pupils were checked immediately after the self-directive dramatization period was 339. The decrease in the number of checks on the self-concept questions for the first dramatization period was 219. The over-all percentage decrease for the first dramatization period was 39.2. The total number of self-concept questions on which these same pupils were checked preceding the second dramatization period was 339; the total number of self-concept questions on which these pupils were checked immediately after the second dramatization period was 105. The decrease in the number of checks on the self-concept questions for the second dramatization period was 234. The over-all percentage decrease for the second dramatization period was 69.0.

Changes in behavior and conversation. What the pupils did and said was a determining factor in the checking of the self-concept questions. Changes in what the pupils did and said provided evidence that changes in self-concept occurred during the time of the dramatization periods. At the beginning of the school year, a large percentage of the pupils in all four of the experimental grades seemingly could not sit still for a complete story to be read to them. They hit, they accused

TABLE XXII

NUMBER OF SELF-CONCEPT CHECKS GRADE FOUR BEFORE AND AFTER THE SELF-DIRECTIVE DRAMATIZATION PERIODS

FIRST DRAMATIZATION PERIOD				SECOND DRAMATIZATION PERIOD			
PUPIL NUMBER	BEFORE	AFTER	DECREASE	PUPIL NUMBER	BEFORE	AFTER	DECREASE
1.	9	4	5	1.	4	1	3
2.	11	7	4	2.	7	3	4
3.	13	6	7	3.	6	2	4
4.	16	7	11	4.	7	1	6
5.	19	12	7	5.	12	4	8
6.	21	10	11	6.	10	5	5
7.	17	12	5	7.	12	3	9
8.	26	20	6	8.	20	9	11
9.	23	13	10	9.	13	2	11
10.	20	12	8	10.	12	6	6
11.	13	9	4	11.	9	0	9
12.	26	17	9	12.	17	6	11
13.	26	23	3	13.	23	11	12
14.	25	13	12	14.	13	3	10
15.	22	15	7	15.	15	4	11
16.	20	8	12	16.	8	2	6
17.	23	14	9	17.	14	5	9
18.	14	6	8	18.	6	1	5
19.	17	9	8	19.	9	5	4
20.	10	4	6	20.	4	0	4
21.	12	9	3	21.	9	4	5
22.	24	21	3	22.	21	10	11
23.	27	16	11	23.	16	4	12
24.	22	10	12	24.	10	0	10
25.	8	4	4	25.	4	0	4
26.	24	10	14	26.	10	2	8
27.	24	24	0	27.	24	7	17
28.	22	9	13	28.	9	2	7
29.	24	15	9	29.	15	3	12
TOTAL	558	339	219		339	105	234

each other of taking their pencils, paper, or books, and the calling of each other such names as "thief" and "liar" was a common practice. Some of the pupils in the second grade, in addition to calling each other names, included their teacher in the name calling. Some of the pupils said they did not want to learn to read. One pupil in the second grade, while getting help with writing, threw his pencil and paper on the floor and refused to try again, although the teacher was being very gentle with him. One boy in the third grade threw his test booklet on the floor and ran to a corner of the room. He covered his face and the observer noted later that tears were in his eyes. He told the observer "I can't answer the questions. They're hard." In the fourth grade, the pupils made sure that very few substitute teachers stayed all of the day. Almost all of the second grade children refused to speak to visitors.

During the second dramatization period, many changes were noted in these pupils. Name calling was not so prominent. Fewer pencils were missing. The pupils in the second grade, without being told to do so, shook hands with visitors to their room and said, "We are glad you came to see us." While these same visitors were there, the pupils asked to not have their play period and read to the visitors instead of going to play. The second grade boy who refused help with reading at the beginning of the year followed an observer outside the classroom and said, "I'll read another story to you when you come back." Some of the children asked their teacher to mail some letters for them that they had written to the observer. One girl wrote, "We are reading stories... . . You are very kind to us. Our teacher is kind to us. You bring us everything we want. You bring us tests and books. . . . Be careful coming back up here."

The observations of the teachers and the observers bear out the conclusions drawn from the data that changes in self-concept did occur in the pupils during the self-directive dramatization periods.

CORRELATION BETWEEN GAINS IN READING AND CHANGES IN SELF-CONCEPT

The relation of progress in reading and changes in self-concept may be seen by examining simultaneously for each pupil the gains in reading in Chapter III and changes in self-concept in this chapter. For example, pupil number one in Table V gained 0.7 in reading. Table XIX shows that this same pupil was checked on 19 fewer self-concept questions immediately after the self-directive dramatization period than at the beginning of the period.

The correlation between progress in reading and changes in self-concept has been computed by the Pearson Product Moment Coeffieient of correlation formula. The level of significance has been determined by use of the formula $t = r\sqrt{\frac{N-2}{1-r^2}}$.

1. A correlation of -.21 was found between progress in reading and changes in self-concept in experimental grade one for the second dramatization period. The relationship was not significant at the .10 level of confidence($t=1.05$).
2. A correlation of .26 was found between progress in reading and changes in self-concept in experimental grade two for the first self-directive dramatization period. A correlation of .09 was found between progress in reading and changes in self-concept in experimental grade two for the second self-directive

dramatization period. Neither relationship was significant at the .10 level of confidence(t=1.35, .45).

3. A correlation of .09 was found between progress in reading and changes in self-concept in experimental grade three for the first self-directive dramatization period. A correlation of .17 was found between progress in reading and changes in self-concept in experimental grade three for the second self-directive dramatization period. Neither relationship was significant at the .10 level of confidence(t=.43, .83).
4. A correlation of .13 was found between progress in reading and changes in self-concept in experimental grade four for the first self-directive dramatization period. A correlation of -.14 was found between progress in reading and changes in self-concept in experimental grade four for the second self-directive dramatization period. Neither relationship was significant at the .10 level of confidence(t=.68, .74).

Although there was a slight positive correlation between reading gains and changes in self-concept in some of the experimental grade groups, no significance was found at the .10 level of confidence.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF SELF-CONCEPT CHANGES AND PROGRESS IN READING

The two questions relative to classroom self-directive dramatization of stories and self-concept were:

1. Can favorable changes in the self-concept of culturally

disadvantaged elementary school children be brought about through the use of self-directive dramatization in the reading program in a regular classroom?

2. Will there be a correlation between gains in reading achievement and changes in self-concept on the part of groups of culturally disadvantaged elementary school children with whom self-directive dramatization in reading is used in a regular classroom?

The self-concept questions were checked by the classrooom teachers and observers who worked with the study. The questions were used as a means of determining self-concept changes in the pupils. Because all questions were stated negatively, a loss of checks on the self-concept questions meant a gain for the pupil. It was assumed that a positive self-concept was conducive to growth in reading, while a negative self-concept was not conducive to progress in reading.

On the basis of the evidence gathered in the study, it was found that changes in behavior did occur during the self-directive dramatization periods. In each grade group there were fewer pupils checked on the self-concept questions after the self-directive dramatization periods (Tables XIX, XX, XXI, XXII) than were checked preceding the dramatization periods. The over-all percentage decrease of checks on the self-concept questions in the experimental grade groups was 50.9.

Some positive correlation was found between gains in reading and changes in self-concept in grades two, three, and, for the first dramatization period, in grade four, but not any correlation was significant at the .10 level of confidence. Because a higher correlation was not found, the question arose as to why it was not higher (a significant correlation

had been found in a similar study done previously with mostly middle class white children). The question has not been resolved. However, it has been conjectured by those who worked with the study that:

1. Due to the difficulty in getting the children to read and work together in the beginning, a longer period of time for self-directive dramatization of stories may have been needed before attempts were made to measure any of the results.
2. Because of the extreme instability of the pupils, there may have been much inaccuracy in checking the self-concept questions.
3. The pupils may have possessed behavior patterns in varying degrees which could not be measured accurately with the instrument used.
4. There may have been other behaviors not included in the self-concept checklist which affected their reading and should have been included in the list.
5. Changes in self-concept may have been delayed for some of the pupils because of the extremeness of their difficulty. Thus, a longer period of self-directive dramatization might have brought about more positive results.

Favorable changes in the behaviors of culturally disadvantaged children occurred during the self-directive dramatization periods. Slight correlations were found between gains in the reading achievement and the changes in self-concept of these children. Those who worked with the study have felt that if a longer period of self-directive

dramatization had been available a greater degree of correlation between reading achievement and self-concept might have been found.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The conclusions reached as a result of this study may be of especial interest to educators, psychologists, sociologists, classroom teachers of the culturally disadvantaged, or to any person interested in culturally disadvantaged children. Four reasons for the study were given in Chapter I. They are as follows:

1. Can significant gains in reading be achieved with groups of culturally disadvantaged elementary school children through the use of self-directive dramatization in the reading program in a regular classroom?
2. Can significantly greater gains in reading be achieved with groups of culturally disadvantaged elementary school children through the use of self-directive dramatization than through the use of methods involving primarily the reading of one or two basic readers in small groups or in the whole class in a regular classroom?
3. Can favorable changes in the self-concept of culturally disadvantaged elementary school children be brought about through the use of self-directive dramatization in the reading program in a regular classroom?
4. Will there be a correlation between gains in reading achievement and changes in self-concept on the part of groups of culturally disadvantaged elementary school children with whom self-directive dramatization in

reading is used in a regular classroom?

Each point has been discussed in detail in Chapters III and IV.

CONCLUSIONS

Following is a summary of the major conclusions:

1. Significant gains in reading were achieved with the four grade groups of culturally disadvantaged elementary school children through the use of self-directive dramatization in the reading program in a regular classroom.
2. During the first period of dramatization, significantly greater gains in reading were achieved by grades two and three of the control group through the use of methods involving primarily the reading of one or two basic readers in small groups or in the whole class in a regular classroom. During the second period of dramatization, significantly greater gains in reading were achieved by all four grades of the experimental group through the use of self-directive dramatization than through the use of methods involving primarily the reading of one or two basic readers in small groups or in the whole class in a regular classroom. For a total of both dramatization periods, significantly greater gains were achieved by the experimental group through the use of self-directive dramatization.
3. Favorable changes in self-concept of culturally disadvantaged children did occur during the self-directive dramatization periods. The over-all percentage decrease

in the number of self-concept questions on which these children were checked was 50.9.

4. Although a slight correlation between progress in reading and changes in self-concept was found in the four grades of the experimental group, no correlation was significant at the .10 level of confidence.

IMPLICATIONS

The implications derived from the results of this experiment are:

1. When children are permitted to select their own reading materials, they become more adept at meeting their needs than the teacher who tells them what to read.
2. Regardless of the grade in which a pupil is found, he should be permitted to read at the grade level where he is reading.
3. A classroom needs many books in it and they should be kept there during the year.
4. Self-directive dramatization of stories in a regular classroom helps to establish a better relationship between the teacher and pupil.
5. In order to help culturally disadvantaged elementary school children work and play together, to share ideas and possessions, to have better opinions of themselves and others, to become more stable, and, in general, to improve the self-concept, self-directive dramatization of stories can be used successfully in the schools.
6. The degree to which a particular behavior inhibited pro-

gress in reading is not known. Therefore, the same behavior for one pupil could possibly have not caused the difficulty in reading for one pupil to the same extent that it did for another.

7. In order to bring about progress in the reading of culturally disadvantaged children in a regular classroom, self-directive dramatization of stories can be used successfully in the schools.

8. For self-directive dramatization to be of optimum value with culturally disadvantaged children, a longer period of time than that covered by the study should be available.

READING REFERENCES

Axline, Virginia. "Mental Deficiency—Symptom or Disease?" Journal of Consulting Psychology, 13: 313-327, October, 1949.

Axline, Virginia. "Nondirective Play Therapy for Poor Readers," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 11: 61-69, March-April, 1947.

Axline, Virginia. Play Therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1947.

Baller, Warren R. and Don C. Charles. The Psychology of Human Growth and Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961.

Bills, R. E. "Nondirective Play Therapy with Retarded Readers," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 14: 140-149, April, 1949.

Bills, R. E. "Play Therapy with Well-Adjusted Readers," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 14: 246-249, August, 1950.

Bloomberg, Claire M. "An Experiment in Play Therapy," Childhood Education, 25: 177-180, December, 1948.

Bottrell, Helen K. "Child Society," in Harold R. Bottrell, (ed.), Applied Principles of Educational Sociology. Harrisburg: The Stackpole Company, 1954.

Cantor, Nathaniel. Dynamics of Learning. Buffalo: Foster and Stewart, 1946.

Coleman, James C. Personality Dynamics and Effective Behavior. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1960.

Combs, Arthur W. and Donald Snygg. Individual Behavior. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

Edwards, Allen L. Statistical Methods for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Rhinehart and Company, 1954.

Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.

Fisher, Bernard. "Group Therapy with Retarded Readers," Journal of Educational Psychology, 44: 354-360, October, 1943.

Garrett, Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: Longman, Green and Company, 1953.

Havighurst, Robert J. Human Development and Education. New York: Longman, Green and Company, 1953.

Hejna, Robert F. Speech Disorders and Non-Directive Therapy. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1960.

Kelley, Earl C. "The Fully Functioning Self," Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming (Washington, D. C., Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development), 1962.

Mayfarth, Frances. "Human Beings I Have Known," Adventures in Human Relations (Washington, D. C., Bulletin of the Association for Childhood Education), 1948.

McGann, Mary. "Dramatic Dialogues for Simultaneous Treatment of Reading and Personality Problems," Journal of Educational Psychology, 38: 96-104, February, 1947.

Prescott, Daniel A. The Child in the Educative Process. New Work: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1957.

Redmount, Robert S. "Description and Evaluation of a Corrective Program for Reading Disability," Journal of Educational Psychology, 39: 347-358, February, 1948.

Rogers, C. R. Counseling and Psychotherapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1942.

Rogers, C. R. "Significant Aspects of Client-Centered Therapy," American Psychologist, 1: 415-422, 1946.

Snygg, Donald and Arthur W. Combs. Individual Behavior. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.

Symonds, Percival M. The Ego and The Self. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1951.

White, R. W. Lives in Progress, A Study of the Natural Growth of Personality. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston, 1952.

Wylie, Ruth C. The Self-Concept. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.